

# SLUM REHABILITATAION AUTHORITY BANDRA, MUMBAI

Bha dup Vakratunda SRA CHS. Ltd. Nec Bank of Baroda, J. M. Road, Bha dup (West), Mumbai – 400 078

... Applicant

Vs

M/s Ideal Builders and Developers F-21 ', Dreams Mall LBS Road, Bha Idup (West), Mumbai – 400 078

... Respondent

ORDER (Passed on (9,07,2019)

The present proceeding is initiated by this Authority pursuant to the dire :tions of Hon'ble High Court vide Order dated 01.04.2019 in Writ Peti on No. 929/2019 filed by Applicant Society in respect of S.R. Scheme on; of of land bearing CTS No. 454 of village Bhandup, Tai-Kurla against the !espondent Developer i.e. M/s. Ideal Builders and developers.

#### FAC 'S IN BRIEF

The Slum dwellers residing on plot of land bearing CTS No. 454 of village Bhandup, Tal. Kurla admeasuring area about 1625 sq. mtrs., have for ed, Bhandup Vakratunda SRA CHS. The plot of land under the said some is declared as Slum and the same is owned by the private own and The Applicant Society appointed Respondent M/s, Ideal Builders and Developer as their developer for implementation of subject S.R. "son me and executed development agreement, Power of Attorney

1

etc. with Respondent Developer for implementation of S.R. sch me under regulations 33(10) read with Appendix IV of DCR 1991.

The Additional Collector(E/R)/SRA and Competent Authority issued Certified Annexure-II on 26.09.2005, for total 52 Nos. of Ium dwellers of out which 33 slum dwellers are held eligible. The Respon ent Developer submitted proposal to SRA on 07.01.2007. On the bas, of Certified Annexure-II SRA issued LOI on 06.08.2009 and revised LC on 13.10.2011 and 22.02.2012. IOA for composite building consistin of Ground + 7th Upper floors issued on 04.10.2011.

The Applicant Society filed complaint to SRA and alleged hat Respondent Developer has failed to pay rent to the eligible sum dwellers who had vacated their structure since 2013. The De Juty Collector (ES)/SRA vide letter dated 07.11.2015 forwarded the sime complaint to Joint registrar/SRA for necessary action. Pursuant to the said complaint hearing was fixed before Joint Registrar/SRA. During the said hearing the Applicant Society pointed out that respon ent Developer did not pay rent to eligible Slum dwellers since year 2013.

However, the Respondent Developer alleged that he has opened a separate Bank Account in union bank of India and he has depoted entramount of Rs.35,02,000/- for the month from October, 201 to September 2017 i.e. for period of 11 months. Since the amount depoted by the Respondent Developer was not as per the circular issued by RA. A show-cause notice under Section 13 (2) of Maharashtra Slum A eas (I.C., & R.) Act, 1971 was issued to Respondent Developer on 16.08. 016 on the ground of delay and non-performance and hearing was ked before the Authority. However, the then CEO/ SRA after her ring concerned parties, passed an order on 02.06.2017 which reads as under; "1) All the members of Bhandup Vakratunda SRA CHS should deride their Developer amicably within a period of three weeks in the interest of their own development.

2) I the Society fails to do so, then the Slum Rehabilitation Authority will itse play the role as competent Developer. Accordingly SRA will cor plete the project in the interest of innocent slum dwellers, those has a become victims of two rival groups."

Thereafter Applicant Society filed Writ Petition No. 1178/2018 before Hon'ble High Court in which Order was passed by Hon'ble High Court of Bombay on 12.10.2018 to hold a meeting for appointment of new developer in accordance with the law within a period of four weeks from the date of Order. The Joint Registrar, SRA thereafter conducted special general body meeting on 14.11.2018 to appoint new developer in a coordance with the circular No. 169 dated 31.12.2015. Accordingly "Mr. I large Builders & Developers" was appointed as new developer in General Body Meeting on 14.11.2018 in the presence of Joint Registrar, SRA

Thereafter Respondent Developer approached to the Apex Grit vance Redressal Committee against the Applicant Society and filed an ppeal being Appeal No. 246 of 2018.

A Writ Petition No.929/2019 was filed against "M/s. Igra Builders & Dev Flopers" in which the order was passed on 01.04,2019 directing the Aut ority to complete the proceedings as prayed for in prayer there n with a period of 8 weeks from the date of the said order is uploaded and the proceeding.

Hee ing:

Accordingly hearing was fixed and notices were issued to cor cerned parties. Respondent Developer was present. Adv. Sahil Say ed on behalf of Applicant Society was present. On 5.05.2019 after hec ing concerned parties matter stood closed for order.

# ARGUMENTS OF APPLICANT SOCIETY BHANDUP VAKRATUNDA SRA ( 15

Applicant Society decided to develop the subject property under ne provision of 33(10) of the Development Control Rules, 1991. Respondint Developer i.e. M/s. Ideal Builders and Developers through its partner cities. Mr. Iabal A. Kothivale approached them and represented that they are reputed builders and developers and have developed several projects in the Mumbai City and he has the financial wherewithal to undertake implementation of Slum Scheme on the said Property and vill rehabilitate all their members within period of 18 months.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Applicant Society veily believed on the representation and assurances given by Respondint Developer and agreed to appoint him as the developer for he implementation of the Slum Scheme on the said Property.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Applicant Soc sty through its then committee members entered in to Developm int Agreement dated 23.12.2004 with Respondent Developer and a Porcer of Attorney was executed on 24.12.2004 in favor of Mr. Iqbal A. Kothivele.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the competent Authority issued Annexure-II on 04.06.2005 in favor of the Applicant Society for the implementation of the Slum Scheme on the said Property. It is alleged that Respondent Developer forged and fabricated the said Annexure-II by making changes in the certified Annexure-II by hand and other modes.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Respondent Developer subsequently entered in to Development Agreement on 28.12.2005 the M/s. Makdum and Makdum Construction Company for he redevelopment of the said property. It is further alleged that he Respondent Developer is in the habit of making false and fabrica ed

It is urther alleged that Respondent Developer also forged signature of dec diperson namely Mr. Shesh Narayan Pathak in the undertaking submitted to the slum Rehabilitation Authority doted 19.05.2011.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Authority issued LOI dated 06.08.2009 in favor of Respondent Developer for the implementation of slum scheme on the said property.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, Respondent Developer alo g with Applicant Society filed Suit No. 1021 of 2010 in the Hon'ble City Civil Court challenging the termination of Development Agreement and 28.05.2005 and the revocation of NOC in the favor of Respondent Development for the implementation of slum scheme on the said property by M/s. Makdum and Makdum Construction Company being the pur orted owner of the said property. The notice of motion preferred in the aid suit for interim relief was dismissed/rejected by the Hon'ble City Court by its order/judgment dated 22.10.2010 by holding that the nate of convenience does not lie in favor of Respondent and the relief claimed is time barred.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Assistant Registrar, Cooperative Society SRA issued Registration Certificate in the favor of Res onder on 23.05.2011 under the provision of Maharashtra Co-op. Soc ety Act? 1760. Further the Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Society SRA removed their erstwhile committee members and appointed new cor mittee members, who were elected by Respondent's members in pecial general body meeting conducted under supervision of Assistant Registrar, Co-op. Society SRA on 30.07.2011.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, SRA issued IOA dated 04.1 ).2011 for composite building comprising of rehab and sale building in fivor of Respondent Developer for the implementation of slum

scheme on the said property. Respondent Developer illegally and without following due process of law evicted majority of their members from respective structures and demolished the same.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, Respondent Developer Initially paid the rent at the rate of Rs.6,000/- per month to their members by in lieu of transit accommodation. Respondent Developer has not paid rent to their members since November, 2013.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, Respondent Developer without obtaining commencement certificate, started illegal construction on the said Property on or about 03.10.2014 and thereby violated the conditions of the LOI and IOA thereby imperited and jeopardized the implementation of Slum Scheme on the said proper 7.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, SRA by its letter da ed 08.09.2015 intimated the Respondent About suspension of its LOI. ne Secretary, SRA also prepared a report dated 28.01.2016 again indicaing delay in the implementation of Slum Scheme on the said propirty attributed to Respondent.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Assistant Registrar, RA by its report dated 08.07.2016 again indicated that Respondent is not making payment of rent in lieu of transit accommodation to their members and is also not complied with the circulars issued by SRA.

notice on 16.08.2016 U/s. 13(2) of Slum Act. Further, applicant soc sty wide its letter dated 05.06.2017 and 13.06.2017 along with the cop of agenda requested Joint Registrar, SRA to supervise its special gen ral body meeting to be held on 21.06.2017.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, in their special gen ral body meeting held on 21.06,2017, out of total 32 members, 27 memlers

attended the meeting, 21 members voted in favor of M/s. Igra builders and developers as it new developer for further implementation of said schome on the said property.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the joint Registrar. SRA prevared a report dated 12.07.2017 pursuant to the said order and resk ution passed in special general body meeting held on 21.06.2017 evil zing that the same was not held in consonance with the said circular. Joint registrar, SRA issued notice dated 27.07.2017 to applicant society and new developer to remain present in the hearing to be held on 3.08.2017 at 12.000 Noon before the Authority. The joint registrar, SRA issued another notice dated 31.07.2017 to new developer intimating that notice dated 27.07.2017 is rescinded and new developer may not remain present for the same. The Authority held on 03.08.2017 was of the opi ion that special general body meeting to appoint new developer should be held under the supervision of the Joint registrar, SRA in consonance with said circular. The Authority directed Joint registrar, SRA to hold their special general body meeting under supervision to appoint new developer.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Joint Registrar, SRA do notice dated 01.09,2017 appointing officer to supervise their special general body meeting to appoint new developer in his pre ance, on 21.09.2017 at 5pm. Authorized officer of Joint Registrar /SR. issued public notice dated 04.09.2017 intimating public at large about their special general body meeting. Authorized officer of Joint Registrar, SRA issued another letter dated 20.09.2017 which was received on 22.09.2017 cancelling their special general body meeting to be held on 21.09.2017 and postponed the same until further notice. Over whelming majority of their members were present on 21.09.2017 but

no meeting was held under supervision of joint registrar took place as authorized officer of joint registrar, SRA did not remain present.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the Applicant soc sty through its officer bearers several time approached the authority and the Joint Registrar, SRA to schedule fresh special general body meeing to appoint new developer but to no avail. The applicant society through its Advocates letter dated 28.12.2017 and 16.01.2018 called upon ne Joint Registrar, SRA to schedule a fresh special General Body Meeting to appoint a developer in consonance with the said circular.

It is the case of Applicant Society that, the applicant Society field writing Petition before Hon'ble Bombay High Court, seeking writing of Mandamus against the Authority and the Joint registrar SRA, to schedule a fresh special General Body Meeting to appoint a develope in consonance with the said circular.

It is the case of the Applicant Society that. Respondent F ≥d chamber summons in the said writ petition, which was declined by Hon'ble Bombay High Court by its order dated 29.08.2018. The afores aid Writ Petition was allowed by the Hon'ble Bombay High Court on 12.10.2018. The Joint Registrar. SRA thereafter conducted Spe ial General Body Meeting on 14.11.2018 to appoint new develope in consonance with the said circular and said order. Accordingly "1 /s. lara Builders & Developers" was appointed as new developer in Gen ral Body Meeting on 14.11.2018 under the supervision of Joint Registrar, RA in accordance with the circular No. 169 dated 31. 2.2015.

Developer stopped paying rent in lieu of transit accommodation to the eigenstance of the year 2013 and he is guilty of inordinate delay in the implementation of Slum Rehabilitation Scheme on the said property.

The members are living elsewhere since 2012 waiting for their respective per nament alternate accommodation.

# ARC UMENTS OF RESPONDENT DEVELOPER VIZ. M/S. IDEAL BUILDERS &

As per the letters dated 31.07.2017 and 15.09.2017 it is the case of the Respondent that, in the operative part of order dated 02.06.2017 pas ed by SRA, it has been no where stated that respondent i.e. M/s. Ide I builders and developers had been terminated from the said S.R. Sch ame and CEO/SRA has nowhere asked the errant slum society to appoint "New developer". The Order dated 02.06.2017 clearly asked the members of the Applicant society to get together and 'decide' about the developer, which means that they have to deiced on supporting the existing developer or SRA may take over the said S.R. Scheme.

It is the case of the Respondent that, in the SRA report submitted to EO/SRA in month of July 2017 the authority mention that the approintment of new developer by the errant slum society is not valid due to representative of cooperative department not being present for the alleged general body meeting held by the errant society. Further the approintment of the proxy developer is contrary to the due process of law and does not even have consent of 70% eligible Slum dwellers and the entire process suspicious and contrary to the rules of Maharashtra Co-sperative Society Act 1960.

of! Or dated 06.08.2009 Respondent developer had to submit 70% cor end of the eligible slum dwellers and the Respondent Immediately after issue of IOA dated 04.10.2011 had submitted 100% consent of the eligible Slum dwellers with registered notary. Hence, the question of Res ondent submitting or procuring or begging the slum dwellers to

support him again does not arise at all. Keeping in the mind the said be refacts and events Respondent requested to withdraw the letter with immediate effect, failing which Respondent shall take up said mo er with the appropriate forum as letter dated 27.07.2017 seems to he ve been issued in nexus with the errant slum society office bearer, the pr xy developer and a MLA (Shri, Sadar Tara singh) who keeps on writing let ars and making phone calls to SRA stating false and misleading facts and seems to have taken keen interest in S.R. Scheme which seems strain as the said MLA is not even the local MLA. The said MLA and another person claiming to be the P.A. to the said MLA has tried in the past and is still trying to influence the CEO/SRA to support the proxy developer thereby not allowing the CEO, SRA and other officers of SRA to take in ny alleged, the person claiming to be a P.A. of said MLA is close aid to a person who is the prime accused and who was arrested in May 201 in a bribery scandal in which the than Revenue Minister was indire tly accused and finally in June 2014 the said minister had to resign this 31 pw the extend of political interference in SRA's day-to-day matters.

It is the case of the Respondent that, Respondent Submitted by letter-dated 15.09.2017 nowhere in the operative order dated 02.06.2—17 the onus of the delay in the S.R. Scheme is put on respondent developer, in fact the CEO, SRA has said that there are two groups in the sum dwellers, and they should ambically decide their support to he developer which means existing developer. Respondent Stated that he has submitted consent/agreements (individual and common) on the experience occasion to SRA as and when demanded. Whereas there is no provision in Maharashtra Slum Areas (I.C. & R.) Act, 1971 to repeate dly submit the consent of the Siurn dwellers to the SRA and there are seviral judgments of High Power Committee (HPC) that repeated submission of

cor lents is not required. The joint registrar, SRA does not have power to terr inate any developer from S.R. Scheme without clear cut written approval of CEO, SRA.

It is the case of the Respondent that in the reports made by the join registrar, SRA it is mentioned that he is proposing certain actions bas ed upon the letter of one senior MLA of the majority ruling party of the state. This means he is not taking decision on merit and are listening to I LA which shows that the judgment of the matter may be prejudice anc against the principle of Natural Justice. It is pointed out that there are several incriminating judgments of Hon'ble High Court regarding dec sion based upon political interface instead of merits, Moist importantly the CEO/SRA conducted a hearing in present of joint reg trar with applicant society members on 03.08.2017 and thereafter the ile after going through the legal department is lying with the CEO. SRA since 31.08.2017 for final instructions and/or order. Therefore as per rou ne protocol the matter is sub-judice (means under judicial cor lideration and hence prohibited form discretion in public) and there sho ld be no new movement in the matters till the file is cleared by the CEC SRA.

### DISI USSIONS AND CONCLUSION:

Act 1971, was already initiated on the grounds of non-payment of rent and also inordinate delay. After considering the rival contentions order do 2.06.2017 was passed by the then CEO, SRA. By this order libers of the Applicant Society were directed to decide their Developer within the period of 3 weeks. The decision was required to be taken by the society in the interest of their own Development. So far as this order is concerned the society has taken steps for appointment of nev Developer. On the other hand the Respondent Developer is

referring the order to draw conclusion that, the appointment has of been terminated. The order is very clear as it states that, society members together should decide about their Developer. This mean that, they were given option to continue with Respondent Develope or to appoint the new Developer of their choice. This order cannot be read to mean that Application for termination of appointment of ne Respondent Developer has been rejected. In the circumstances he option chosen by the Society to elect new Developer will have to be taken into consideration.

The Developers contention as to he was having more than 705 of consent and he cannot be ask to take consent repeatedly have no bearing as the appointment is terminated by the Society in pursual ce of the order dated 02.06.2017.

The Society has placed on record certain facts stating as to how there is total inaction on part of Respondent Developer. It is argued by the Society that by the Development Agreement the Respondent Developer had promised to complete the Rehabilitation within 18 menths from the date of agreement signed in 2004. However, till dute nothing that taken place.

The LOI was issued on 06.08.2009 and the same was revised on 03.10.2011 and 22.02.2012 even 10A was issued on 04.10.2011 for composite building comprising of ground + 7 floors. The slum dwe ers vacated, there structures and those were demolish in the year 20.13. Even there after the rent was not paid to the slum dwellers. For arrears of rent proceeding had taken before the Joint Registrar/SRA and direction were not complied. Therefore proceedings under section 1 (2) were initiated wherein above said order dated 02.07.2017 was passed.

The Developer has not pointed out that, all the arrears of the rent has a been paid to the slum dwellers and on the other hand its sub rission doesn't referred to this issue.

One of the submission of the Developer is that, in order dated 02.0 \$,2017 it had not been observed that the onus of delay is on the Res rondent Developer. The facts has to inaction and not completing the subject S. R. Scheme before passing of order dated 02.06.2017 as well as after the order are clear enough and therefore it cannot be said that the Developer is not responsible for delay.

After the order dated 02,06,2017 the Society had made attempt for appointment of new Developer. They had submitted their letters dat id 05,06.2017 and 13.06.2017. Those letters were for holding General Boc Meeting for appointment of new Developer on 21.06.2017. They have pleaded that in the said meeting out of 32 members 27 members wer: present and out of them 21 eligible members voted in favour of Developer M/s. Igra Builders and Developers. However in this me Iting representative of Joint Registrar, SRA was not present. There Joint Register/SRA also issued notice dated 01.09.2017 for a afte me ting to be held in present of representative on 21.09.2017 for the age Inda of Appointment of new Developer. However, the same was not ma prialized as the meeting was canceled. Ultimately the Applicant Soc sty moved to Hon'ble High Court in Writ Petition No. 1178 of 2018 and the Hon'ble High Court passed order dated 12.10.2018. As per the dire tion of Hon'ble High Court General Body Meeting was held on 14.1 :20)8 in presence of representative of Joint Registrar/SRA and age n the new Developer M/s. Igra Builders and Developers came to be object S. R. Scheme. The Joint Rec strar has submitted report dated 17.11,2018 and stated that out of 32 e gible slum dwellers 25 were present and out of those 25 eligible slum

dwellers 18 slum dwellers voted in favour of appointment of rew developer M/s. Igra builders and Developers. Apparently the Soc ety has finally decided in compliance of requirement of circular No. 69 dated 31.12.2015 and as such the Society has repeatedly refused to consider the continuation of Respondent Developer.

In the aforesaid circumstances following order has been passed.

#### **ORDER**

- 1. The termination of appointment of Respondent Developer i.e. 1 /s. Ideal Builders and Developers in respect of the S.R. Scheme on plo of land bearing plot of land bearing CTS No CTS No.454 of Village Bhanc up, Tal. Kurla is hereby confirmed.
- 2. The appointment of new Developer M/s. Igra Builders and Developers by General Body Resolution dated 14.11.2018 is here by confirmed. He should take further steps to pursue the Scheme within an emonth of the date of this order, as per the law, rules and regulation of SRA and obtain LOI.
- 3. The newly appointed Developer should reimburse the actual expenses I legally incurred by the Respondent Developer for implementation of subject S.R. Scheme till date of this order as determined u/s 13 (3) of the Slum Act.

Place: - Mumbai

Date: 09.07.2019

Chief Executive Officer
Slum Renabilitation Authority

No. SRA/CEO Order/ Bhandup Vakratunda 13 (2)/ /2019/ SRA/c low/31430 Date: 10 07 - 2019

### Cot y to:

Bhandup Vakratunda SRA CHS. Ltd. Near Bank of Baroda, J. M. Road, Bhandup (West), Mumbai – 400 078 M/s. Ideal Builders and Developers F-219, Dreams Mall LBS Road, Bhandup (West), Mumbai – 400 078 Mumbai-33.

Deputy Chief Engineer-I/SRA

Deputy Collector (E.S.)/ SRA

Joint Registrar (Eastern & Western Suburbs)/SRA

Finance Controller/SRA
Chief Legal Consultant/SRA

Astt. Town Planner /SRA

Administrative Officer/SRA

Officer – To update the fact sheet and computer record.